



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,953	11/14/2003	Xing-Ya Li	AVERP3331USA	3698

7590 09/08/2005

Armand P. Boisselle  
Renner, Otto, Boisselle & Sklar, LLP  
Nineteenth Floor  
1621 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44115-2191

EXAMINER
----------

ZIRKER, DANIEL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*HL*

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/713,953

*S*  
Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Zirker

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/18/04</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

Art Unit: 1771

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-25, drawn to a label, classified in class 428, subclass 304.4.
  - II. Claims 26-41, drawn to labeling processes, classified in class 427, subclass 207.1
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:
3. Inventions Group II and Group I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the substrate can be coated with the adhesive which dries before being incorporated into the claimed label article; it is also noted that the two process claims each refer to label article claims which are not presently set forth in the claims.
4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
5. During a telephone conversation with Heidi Boelefeld on August 31, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-25. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 26-41 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1771

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 6-21, 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the Examiner first notes that a minor informality exists in claim 3 wherein after "copper" there should be a comma. Of a more serious nature, in claim 6, next to last line, "mn" should be —nm—. In claims 12, 23, and 25 proper Markush language should be utilized, and claim 13 at present adds nothing to claim 12 and appears to be a duplicate thereof. In claim 14 "proteins" are not believed to be resins.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1771

10. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dronzek, US 6,306,242, taken in view of Butters et al. The primary reference discloses (note particularly The Abstract, Col 4, line 58 – Col 5, line 2, Col 5, lines 30 – 43, Col 7, lines 42 – 53) a multilayer label which can be suitably metalized on a desired surface (Col4, line 66 – Col5, line 2) and is also coated with a suitable water based adhesive (Col 4 , lines 58 – 59). The reference lacks a teaching of the presence of a suitably located nano-porous layer present in the label structure. The secondary reference discloses (note particularly the Abstract, Col 1, lines 12-15, Col 2, lines 2-5, line 38- Col 3 line 5, Col 3, line 60 – Col 4, line 25, Col 5 lines 48 – 52, lines 57-60, Claims 1-3) a multilayered sheet suitable for use as a label (Col 1, line 13) which is formed from an inkable sheet which includes the combination of a non porous polymeric layer and a porous, ink absorbent resin layer (Col 2, lines 2-5) that can feature the presence of nano-particles and a suitable resin binder in certain embodiments . Additionally, the porous layer contains voids or pores of the dimensions applicants contemplate (Col 2, lines 58-65) and as such is believed to meet the limitations required by applicants' claim 6. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill, desirous of improving the print accepting properties of the labels disclosed in Dronzek, would incorporate the nano-porous layer found in the secondary reference into its disclosed metalized labels and thereby form, or render obvious, the claimed genus of labels. With respect to the dependent claims, these are each believed to be, if not expressly or inherently disclosed, obvious modifications to one of ordinary skill, in the absence of unexpected results.

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

Art Unit: 1771

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 22 – 25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8, 20 and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,761,969 to Li et al taken in view of Dronzek '242. More particularly, the primary reference is the parent divisional of the present application, and the above newly presented claims, which applicants admit in their Preliminary Amendment are new claims not present in the parent application, contain the further presence of a metalized layer in the label laminate. However, this last limitation, as has already been mentioned, is found in Dronzek, e.g. Col 4, lines 66 – 67 and thus with the references being clearly combinable the claims are clearly subject to this double patenting rejection.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note also Wilkie.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Zirker whose telephone number is 571-272-1486.

Art Unit: 1771

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:30 to 6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Zirker  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1771

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daniel Zirker". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.